REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the above-referenced application are respectfully requested. The foregoing amendments are responsive to the February 5, 2007 Office Action. Applicants respectfully request entry of the requested amendments and reconsideration of the application in view of the following comments.

Response to the Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C § 103

Claims 4-6, 9-11 and 20-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,496,979 issued to Chen, et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,555,416 issued to Owens, et al. The rejection asserts that Chen allegedly teaches each element of the claims except for remotely issuing a recall command, which is allegedly taught by Owens. Claims 23-24 are canceled herein.

The claims as amended are directed toward a method and a server which issues a recall command for uninstalling applications on a wireless device in response to the remote recall command. The recall command includes a unique application identification for a targeted application, wherein the uninstalling of the targeted applications do not require end-user interaction.. The recall command determines whether one or applications on the wireless device should be uninstalled. Paragraph [0010] of the specification provides support for having the recall command include a unique application identification.

None of the cited art teaches or suggests receiving a remote recall command including a unique application identification for a targeted application over the wireless network. This allows specific identification and removal targeted applications to be controlled by someone other than the end-user. Applications may need to be uninstalled for a variety of reasons, and these can be monitored and determined by persons or entities involved with the development

and/or issuance of the program and/or those involved with the function of the wireless network (see specification, paragraph 0010 and 0011). Thus, in the present invention, a network operator can determine that a program needs to be uninstalled (which can be for a variety of reasons as described in the specification). The network operator can then issue the uninstall command, which will be remotely received by the wireless device upon boot-up and communication with the wireless network without any end-user interaction.

Chen only teaches connecting a wireless device to a computer and uninstalling applications based on instructions from the user. . However, Chen is based on the end-user launching an application management program 12, similar to using the application install/uninstall feature of a desktop computer such as through the control panel of Microsoft Windows. Thus, the user can then select the programs to load or unload. No remote uninstall command is ever sent, and everything done by Chen involves end-user interaction. Owens only teaches remote install commands. Nothing in Owens teaches or suggests having the ability to remove applications from remote devices. Having the ability to remotely recall applications is different from remotely installing applications. The concept of remotely and automatically removing a program is not addressed in Owens.

Further, the claims are amended herein to specify the recall command includes a unique application identification for a targeted application. There is nothing in Chen or Owens that teaches the recall command would include a unique identification for the targeted application. By having a unique application identification, a database may be used to determine which devices have the application that is to be recalled, and issue a recall command to those devices.

In view of the foregoing distinctions, Applicants respectfully submit that independent Claims 4, 10, and 25 are patentably distinguished over the cited art. Applicants respectfully

submit that Claims 4, 10, and 25 are in condition for allowance, and Applicants respectfully request allowance of Claims 4, 10, and 25.

Claims 5-6, 9, 11, and 20-22 depend either directly or indirectly from one of the independent claims. Each dependent claim further defines the independent claim from which it depends. In view of the foregoing remarks regarding Claims 4, 10, and 25, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 5-6, 9, 11, and 20-22 are likewise in condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully request allowance of dependent Claims 5-6, 9, 11, and 20-22.

CONCLUSION

In light of the amendments contained herein, Applicants submit that the application is in condition for allowance, for which early action is requested.

Please charge any fees or overpayments that may be due with this response to Deposit Account No. 17-0026.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated May 7, 2007

By: /James T. Hagler/
     James T. Hagler
     Reg. No. 40,631
     (858) 651-0266

QUALCOMM Incorporated
Attn: Patent Department
5775 Morehouse Drive
San Diego, California 92121-1714
Telephone: (858) 658-5787
Facsimile: (858) 658-2502

(AMENDMENTFORM.VER1.0-07/30/03)